

Page Denied

JAN 25 1967

Advertising: Vietnam Book Stirs Response

By PHILIP H. DOUGHERTY

When The Reporter magazine people prepared the book entitled, "Vietnam: Why," last fall it was intended only as a promotion item for advertisers, potential advertisers and ad agencies. Now it is in its third printing at \$1 a copy, and the magazine can't keep up with the demand.

The magazine even got orders from the White House and the Central Intelligence Agency—and doesn't that make you wonder.

The reason behind the book was given this way by a magazine spokesman:

"Everyone said that Vietnam would influence last November's elections. Well, if you're going to vote on it you should know about it."

Shirley Katzander, the director of promotion, culled through 1965 and 1966 issues and came up with 21 articles which, with a foreword, filled up 56 pages.

Six thousand books were printed, 3,500 were mailed to the advertising and agency set and another 500 to those on the press list.

That was last September and with 2,000 left the magazine decided to sell them through a coupon-containing ad in its own pages.

"We were astounded and delighted," Mrs. Katzander said of the results.

An Expanded Version

So an expanded and updated version with 21 articles in 64 pages was sent to press and 7,000 run off, of which 4,500 have gone to newsstands across the country.

There is no record yet of how the issues on the stands are moving but the magazine is happy to say that it sold 5,000 through the ad and another 5,000 are now running off the presses.

"Can't keep them in supply," said the pleased Mrs. Katzander, who is "fascinated by this reaction."

The C.I.A. ordered 16 copies sent special delivery last October then called for 20 more, and in December, the Agency for International Development in Hawaii cabled for 50 copies to be airmailed.

The White House only asked for five copies, but the Navy has called for 600. There have been orders from campuses, military men, an ad man in Philadelphia, who wanted to distribute 20 to members of the Main Line Unitarian Church, and from the only American among the 40,000 folks living in Kolding, Denmark, who needed ammunition before addressing the local men's club.

Are the folks at The Reporter proud of the drawing power of

an ad in their magazine? You bet they are.

THE INDEPENDENT
February 1966



National Review's Need For Funds

National Review this month made its annual plea for financial support from its wealthier readers. Not wishing to chance missing a single possible dollar, the magazine sent a six-page letter to every one of its subscribers, signed by William Buckley.

The magazine outlined the recent experiences of conservatives. Although some other people thought that Senator Goldwater had been running for the Presidency in 1964 with the expectation of winning, *National Review* did not. Said Buckley: "It (the election results) would have been a great defeat if we could reasonably have hoped to attain the presidency, but few of us thought this likely—certainly Senator Goldwater did not."

The arch-conservative journal quoted praise from many stalwarts among the prominent people in rightwing circles. These included Claire Booth Luce, Senator Goldwater and Thomas Van Sickle. Latter is chairman of the Young Republican National Federation.

Buckley outlined the financial plight of the magazine, and it was pretty much the same song he had sung five and six years ago.

"The fact of the matter is," he wrote, "we are dead broke."

He blamed the acute financial problem on "the economics of publishing a journal the price of which is psychologically determined by the prices of the mass magazines which are subsidized by the lavish patronage of the major advertisers."

He pointed out that in 1933, *New Republic* sold for six dollars a year. Now, with the cost of publishing tripled, its cost has inched forward only a dollar or two.

National Review, said Buckley, "shows a cash deficit of over one hundred thousand dollars. . . . We have an understanding (with printers and papermakers) that if we cannot, by the 15th of May, come up with sufficient pledges to meet the existing deficit . . . they can come in on that day and remove our desks and our typewriters and our three sets of bound volumes, which is about the sum total of our assets."

(Buckley neglected to mention the two small radio stations owned by the magazine which he described earlier in his letter as making a small profit.)

In addition to crying wolf about the magazine's plight, Buckley reminded readers that the magazine was being sued for libel by Dr. Linus Pauling, and then maliciously proceeded to repeat the libel, citing as his authority the irresponsible Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Buckley, who is a millionaire by birth, obviously isn't going to allow his magazine to fold, even if he doesn't receive contributions from "30 persons for \$1,000; 30 persons for \$500 and 800 persons for \$100."

An Appraisal Of The Five Liberal Magazines

Until fairly recently (see story below) there were five major liberal magazines in the country. These were *The Nation*, *New Republic*, *The Progressive*, *Frontier* and *The Reporter*.

The Reporter has invariably been dull reading. It is a magazine to leaf through. Reading time is often five minutes from cover to cover. It has a certain phony snob appeal for people who like to believe they are informed. It is as "liberal" as a cold baked potato standing in the rain for two days.

The Progressive has become a staid journal for "old line" progressives. It is uneven, mostly monotonous but paradoxically, it sometimes contains lively well-written material. It is the middle-aged magazine, the reformer still clinging to some of yesteryear's tattered ideals.

Frontier is a regional magazine with a mixture of regional and international interests. It has published strongly on vital issues, particularly where they are of local interest (i.e. blacklists). There isn't enough of it and its limited circulation, revenue, etc., doesn't permit of larger portions.

The Nation is the "grand old lady" of liberal magazines. Although its greatness is of the past, it takes forceful positions on critical issues and helps to clarify thinking on others. Although *The Reporter* has many times the circulation of *The Nation*, there is no doubt that *The Nation* has more influence. Lack of dynamic promotion and the telling erosion caused by a "sameness" in viewpoint have had a negative effect, but at times when *The Nation* seems most tired, it still manages to come up with surprises. It is consistently more courageous than either *The Reporter* or *The Progressive*.

New Republic is an old magazine that has a refreshing newness about it. It is often the best-written, best-edited of the five. It frequently has a sense of immediacy that the others lack. And, it often contains the most information. It is a far cry from the *New Republic* of ten—even of five years ago. The name is the same and the format similar. But the game is different and *New Republic* is closer to the actual field of combat than the other four. What it lacks in vision it makes up for in vitality.

(Editor's Note: The above appraisals are made without regard to the relationships of the five magazines to *The Independent*.

(It is ironic that four of the five will not accept our paid advertising—each for its own peculiar reason. The reasons have been reported in our pages for the amusement of our readers, but for the benefit of new subscribers, here is a recap:

The Progressive is a family magazine and is embarrassed by the ads, particularly the Lyle Stuart ads for anti-clerical books. *New Republic* publisher Gilbert Harrison was "personally offended" by the title "The Dollar and the Vatican" by Avro Manhattan in an ad. Without seeing the book, he insisted that the title be deleted. When this information was publicized he was embarrassed to the point that he barred all future advertising. *The Nation's* new publisher is embarrassed by the sex-related books that we sell. *The Reporter's* publisher barred ads for this paper under its original name [Exposé] because he thought the name "too sensational.")

Financing Liberal Journals

How do liberal journals survive? All of them operate at a loss. With some, the loss is quite substantial.

New Republic, *Frontier*, *The Nation* and *The Reporter* all depend on their wealthy publishers for survival subsidies.

The Progressive makes an annual appeal for funds from its readers.

Ramparts began with its publisher's money. As this grew thin, it sought contributions (\$100,000) as the printer held up copies because payment wasn't forthcoming. *Ramparts* finally was able to secure new financing and seems assured of publication for some time to come.

APR 27 1965

U.S. USES AIR AMERICA TO SUPPLY LAO TROOPS

Hanoi in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 0400 GMT 27 April 1965--S

(Commentary: "From the So-Called Air America Company to the U.S. Air Force's Activities in Laos")

(Text) Since the downing of the (?C-47 plane No. 152) of the Air America Company on the Plaine des Jarres while it was bringing supplies to a military position of the Savannakhet group on road No. 9 in southern Laos--thanks to which the Pathet Lao forces caught nine war prisoners, including one American, five Chinese of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and three Thai aboard the plane and seized a number of objects and documents proving clearly the illegal activities of the Americans in Laos--the U.S. aggressors have continued to deny their military activities in Laos. To defend the illegal activities of the Air America Company, the U.S. ambassador to Laos has often said that for humanitarian purposes the Americans have been carrying out supply operations for the Meo refugees in Laos. Yet everyone knows that in southern Laos no Meo refugee has tried to (?seek security) in a military position of the Savannakhet clique. Moreover, the Thai war prisoners aboard the crashed plane confessed that the plane was bringing military supplies to the Muong Sai post on (several words indistinct). This fact constitutes undeniable evidence that the U.S. imperialists have tried to undermine the Laotian peace and neutrality through the Air America Company.

Recently, with their brazen scheme of expanding the war in Vietnam and Laos, the U.S. aggressors deem it unnecessary to hide their faces as pirates, and their propaganda machinery has overtly dealt with their acts of intervention in Laos. The U.S. journal the REPORTER of 15 April has disclosed that it is the CIA that has been using 50 cargo planes of the Air America Company to bring foods, medicines, and weapons to their private raider groups in Laos. Warner, a correspondent of this review in southeast Asia, clearly said that for anticommunist purposes the Americans have chosen the solution of overt intervention in the war in Laos (several words indistinct) and have used the Air America Company for that purpose. This air company, together with two other civilian air companies, is using more than 200 airfields in the areas controlled by the Americans and their lackeys to carry out illegal missions. Warner also disclosed that the Air America Company is employing U.S., Lao, Thai, and even South Vietnamese pilots to carry out transportation and supply flights for the Americans and their lackeys in Laos. The facts disclosed by this journal are actually part of the truth about the U.S. plot to step up their special war in Laos and to expand actively the war there.

In defiance of the Geneva agreements on Laos, the U.S. imperialists and their lackey have continued to introduce more military personnel, troops, and weapons into Laos to help their lackeys in Laos attack and occupy the liberated area and to (?sabotage the north).

They have also relied on the illegal appeal of Prince Souvanna Phouma--to whom they suggested the idea of launching such an appeal--to send squadrons of aircraft, including the most modern, such as the F-100, F-101, F-105, B-57, and so forth, to dump hundreds of tons of bombs, including phosphorous and napalm bombs and poisonous chemicals, on Laotian villages to kill the Laotian people in an extremely barbarous manner.

The fact that 13 U.S. aircraft were downed and 11 others were hit by the (?troops and people) of Savannakhet and Khammouane in the week between 11 and 19 April clearly proves the correctness of the aforementioned denunciation and is at the same time a serious warning to the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen in Laos. The aforementioned facts clearly prove that the U.S. acts aim at expanding the war in Laos and North and South Vietnam and along with (few words indistinct) are calculated maneuvers aimed at expanding the war throughout Indochina and are the root of the confused situation in this part of the world.

JANUARY 1965

(continued from outer envelope) has had much better luck. It solved the whole problem of direction and identification by proposing to move ahead, but it is still difficult to see in which direction.

—Description of our two political parties as drawn by THE REPORTER, which offers you herewith an opportunity to enter a year's subscription at half price.

Dear Reader:

And that about sums it up:

The Reporter neither brays like the Donkey, nor trumpets like the Elephant.

As a political beast, it's like that rarest of species described by Cyrano as the "hippocampelephantocamelos." Or possibly like that equally rarest of humans, you -- the caterwauling freethinker.

(If you've always voted a straight ticket, and your grandfather did so before you, tear the enclosed savings card to shreds. Use it for insulation.

(But if you're interested in joining such varied and vivid institutions as the CIA, Tallulah Bankhead, Laurance Rockefeller, Walter Cronkite and more than a third of the U. S. Senate -- all Reporter subscribers ... preserve the card and read on. This free-wheeling fortnightly is ambrosia.)

Founded only 16 years ago, The Reporter commands a position in America comparable to The Economist in England. To people who take public affairs seriously, it's become as indispensable as thinking. The President himself, and some 184,999 friends and enemies read it, quote it, heed it.

Contrary to its name, The Reporter doesn't report -- at least in the day-to-day sense. When a man can choose from the New York Times and Herald Tribune, the Monitor, the Post-Dispatch, the Milwaukee Journal, Louisville Courier-Journal, Washington Post,

Kansas City Star, Chicago Daily News, Los Angeles Times, three newsweeklies and Huntley & Brinkley ... why repeat?

What The Reporter does, instead, is a unique job of digging for new facts. Of weighing, analyzing, defining. Of interpreting, commenting, recommending. And to the delight of many (and the consternation of some), it has scored a hatful of "firsts":

Despite virulent attacks by McCarthy and his supporters, The Reporter was the first magazine to detail his publicity techniques, to show the emptiness of his "numbers game," and to reveal his destructive effect on people in government, industry and education.

When discussion of radioactive fallout was considered in some quarters as downright subversive, The Reporter published a detailed article on tests in Nevada that rained fallout on the U.S. -- findings later substantiated by a UN Commission report.

Other firsts: breaking the news of wiretapping in government and business; the political shenanigans of some Texas millionaires; Laos; West Berlin; and influence. The investigation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a direct result of the two articles on lobbying published by The Reporter.

But balance of payments, the Common Market, the high cost of Space, and Vietnam aren't the only "beats" covered by The Reporter.

This magazine is equally in its element when it examines the arts. Like any well-rounded citizen, The Reporter reflects more than just political and economic arenas. It keeps your eye and ear tuned to cultural manifestations as well -- proscenium, sound stage, recording studio, coffee house, the 24-inch cathode tube screen.

Who's behind The Reporter's comment, criticism, and kudos? A staff that sees their magazine's usefulness to the Administration as being "in direct relation to our independence of it."

The Editor and Publisher is Max Ascoli, who, as early as 1931, left his native Italy because he could not tolerate Mussolini's fascism. His public statement, made in The Atlantic Magazine,

upon becoming a U.S. citizen, ranks with some of Bartlett's choicest:

"Americans are born -- not made. There are people who -- no matter where they are born -- can fully find themselves only when they come over here."

The contributors? There's a saying in Washington that if you can't get through to the White House by telephone, write your message in The Reporter. Quite a number of distinguished people have left messages:

Henry A. Kissinger, Senator Stuart Symington, Dean Acheson, Senators Hubert H. Humphrey and Jacob K. Javits have all made major policy statements or analyses through the pages of The Reporter. And when General Eisenhower occupied the White House, Senator John F. Kennedy used the same route to talk to Ike.

The day-to-day writers? The people who write The Reporter have authority.

Seventy-one out of 83 Washington correspondents have voted The Reporter "most fair and reliable" among magazines reporting politics. And year after year, the profession votes The Reporter some of journalism's most meaningful honors.

The Reporter seems to "grow" talented writers. It's a pleasant, rewarding habit, especially when our discoveries become famous. To name a few: social critic Marya Mannes, essayist William Lee Miller, Washington Correspondent Meg Greenfield, Mediterranean Correspondent Claire Sterling, Berlin Correspondent George Bailey, Paris Correspondent Edmond Taylor.

It does little good to change the brand of daily paper or news-weekly you read. News, for the most part, is news. The Reporter should be added, not substituted.

A promise, however: read through each 50-some page issue as it comes out twice a month, and you'll find yourself undeniably richer -- more ready for combat at the conference table, more vocal when the martinis are poured, and genuinely

more interested in joining in when friends talk about Reporter articles they've read.

The enclosed brochure gives a sampling of recent fare from The Reporter, and some indication of the wealth of illustration that enhances its glossy pages. Look it over before making up your mind.

There are two ways, at present, you can see The Reporter. You can wade through the Congressional Record (the Congress constantly inserts stories in The Reporter in the Record).

Or simpler, you can mail the enclosed card. As a new subscriber, you pay only half price. The subscription term is for one full year, the offer is half price (not the regular \$7.00, but \$3.50), and there's no need to pay until later.

For the present, just your signature is needed. May we look for your subscription in the next mail?

Cordially,

George Hinckley

George Hinckley
Circulation Manager

GH:A

P.S. If you are already a subscriber, we beg your pardon. Perhaps you would like to pass this invitation on to a friend who would also appreciate The Reporter -- and the savings this introductory offer brings.

THE REPORTER

660 MADISON AVENUE • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10021

NEW YORK
JOURNAL AMERICAN

AUG 31 1964

Doug Carter (ex-Natl
Affairs ed at "Reporter" mag) is now
LBJ's No. 1 phrase-dreamer-upper. Car-
ter was the man who coined the phrase
"Most Americans Like" (in LBJ's accept-
ance oration) which lifted the conven-
tioncers out of their pews—and which
they lustily echo'd as the rest of us howled
with glee . . .

Page Denied

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied